

ULTRARAPIDLY DECREASING ULTRADIFFERENTIABLE FUNCTIONS,
WIGNER DISTRIBUTIONS AND DENSITY MATRICES

JEAN-MARIE AUBRY

ABSTRACT

Spaces $\mathcal{S}_\omega, \mathcal{S}_{\{\omega\}}, \mathcal{S}_{(\omega)}$ of ultradecreasing ultradifferentiable (or for short, ultra- $\mathcal{S}$) functions, depending on a weight $e^{\omega(x)}$, are introduced in the context of quantum statistics. The corresponding coefficient spaces in the Fock basis are identified, and it is shown that the Hermite expansion is a tame isomorphism between these spaces. These results are used to link decrease properties of density matrices to corresponding properties of the Wigner distribution.

1. Introduction

1.1. Quantum states

A quantum state is a vector of unit norm in some Hilbert space, for instance $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. In quantum optics (our subjacent model throughout this paper), the simplest states decrease like the Gaussian, and have the same regularity (their Fourier transform decreases like the Gaussian as well). One can however easily encounter *super Gaussian* states whose wave function decreases still rapidly, but not as fast as the Gaussian, like for instance $|f(x)| \leq Ce^{-\frac{|x|^\beta}{2}}$ for $0 < \beta \leq 2$, and whose Fourier transform decreases at the same rate (the restriction $\beta \leq 2$ comes from the uncertainty principle, detailed in § 2.2). Rapidly decreasing self-Fourier functions, of importance in optics [7, 9, 10], fall under this category.

The class of compactly supported functions f that have a regularity comparable to $|\widehat{f}(\xi)| \leq Ce^{-\frac{|\xi|^\beta}{2}}$ is called a class of *ultradifferentiable* functions (in the sense of Beurling, see [5]). The classes of functions that we introduce in § 2 are related but strictly larger, because we replace compact support with an “ultrafast” decrease condition.

When both conditions ($|f(x)| \leq Ce^{-\frac{|x|^\beta}{2}}$ and $|\widehat{f}(\xi)| \leq Ce^{-\frac{|\xi|^\beta}{2}}$) are satisfied, f can be called an “ultrafast decreasing ultradifferentiable” function. More generally, following Gröchenig and

Zimmerman [12], we can replace $x \mapsto \frac{|x|^\beta}{2}$ by a *weight function* ω satisfying certain conditions (Definition 1). The spaces thus obtained can be viewed as the ultradifferentiable version of the Schwartz class $\mathcal{S}$; for short we call them spaces of *ultra- $\mathcal{S}$* functions.

1.2. The Fock basis

The natural basis of $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ for the problems of quantum optics is the one formed by the Hermite functions

$$h_m(x) := (2^m m! \sqrt{\pi})^{-\frac{1}{2}} H_m(x) e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}},$$

where $H_m(x) := (-1)^m e^{x^2} \frac{d^m}{dx^m} e^{-x^2}$ is the m -th Hermite polynomial. The normalization above ensures that $\langle h_m, h_n \rangle = \delta_{m,n}$.

In terms of time/frequency, the Hermite functions are perfectly balanced, because they are eigenvectors of the Fourier transform[†]

$$\widehat{h_m} = (-i)^m h_m. \quad (1)$$

This basis is also called the *Fock basis* and the h_m are the *Fock states* (the m -photons state in the case of light). Note that (1) characterizes “self-Fourier” functions as the ones having non-zero Hermite coefficients only for $m \in 4\mathbb{N}$.

A few more properties will be needed. For instance, h_n is also an eigenvector of the *Hermite operator*

$$(x^2 - \frac{d^2}{dx^2})h_n(x) = (2n+1)h_n(x).$$

Some decrease properties of $h_n(x)$ are stated in Lemma 3.7.

1.3. Outline of the results

Despite their simple definition, the study of the functional properties of Hermite series is in many cases a difficult problem. The L^p case, for instance, is the object of a book by Thangavelu [26]. A question similar to ours has also been investigated numerically by Boyd in [4]. The case $\omega(x) = Cx$ was treated by Janssen and van Eijndhoven [17]. More anecdotically, the decrease of the Hermite coefficients of a certain function has been related to properties of the Riemann ζ function by Grawe in [11]. Finally, Langenbruch [21] has treated the problem starting from a slightly different definition for the function spaces (conditions of the type $\|x^\alpha D^\beta f\|_\infty \leq M_{\alpha+\beta}$); in fact a part of his proofs could be adapted and reused here.

[†]The definition that we use is $\widehat{f}(\xi) := (2\pi)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int f(x) e^{-i\xi x} dx$

Our first goal in this paper is to characterize the class of ultra- $\mathcal{S}$ functions introduced above in terms of Hermite coefficients; this is done, up to a multiplicative constant on ω , in § 3. The main result in this paper is Theorem 1 in § 3.1.

The next question occurs when one considers a so-called mixed state: that is, the statistical result of a physical experiment where there is an uncertainty on the quantum state itself. Let us say that, with probabilities $\mathbf{p}_0, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots$, the experiment produces orthogonal states $\psi_0, \psi_1, \dots$. All this information is contained in the operator

$$\rho := \sum_i \mathbf{p}_i \langle \cdot, \psi_i \rangle \psi_i,$$

where $\langle \cdot, \psi_i \rangle \psi_i$ is the projector on the subspace generated by ψ_i . If more than one of the $\mathbf{p}_i$ is non-zero, then the state is called *mixed*. In other words, a pure state is one that can be described by a single wave functions: for instance $\psi = \sum_i \sqrt{\mathbf{p}_i} \psi_i$.

It is easily seen, as in Leonhardt's reference book [22], that ρ is Hermitian, that its eigenvalues are nonnegative with a sum $\text{tr}(\rho) = 1$, and that these conditions are sufficient to make a mixed quantum state.

For a more graphic representation, one can also consider the *Wigner distribution* associated to ρ . It is a function of two variables $q, p \in \mathbb{R}$ (or rather, a function of $q + ip \in \mathbb{C}$), defined as

$$\Phi_\rho(q, p) := \sum_i \frac{\mathbf{p}_i}{2\pi} \int e^{ipx} \psi_i(q - \frac{x}{2}) \overline{\psi_i(q + \frac{x}{2})} dx. \quad (2)$$

For some reasons, it is sometimes easier to work with

$$\tilde{\Phi}_\rho(q, p) := \frac{1}{2} \Phi_\rho\left(\frac{q}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{p}{\sqrt{2}}\right).$$

The transform $\rho \mapsto \tilde{\Phi}_\rho$ is an isometry between $\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathbb{R}))$ and $L^2(\mathbb{C})$; its inverse is called the *Weyl transform*[†]. The Wigner distribution is very useful for the interpretation of experiments, such as in quantum homodyne tomography (*op. cit.*, see also the lectures notes edited by Paris and Řeháček [24]).

For a pure state ψ , or in terms of operators, $\rho_\psi = \langle \cdot, \psi \rangle \psi$, the Wigner representation of ρ_ψ is given by a simpler form of (2) called the *Wigner transform* of ψ , which is the quadratic form

$$\Phi(\psi, \psi)(q, p) := \Phi_{\rho_\psi}(q, p) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int e^{ipx} \psi(q - \frac{x}{2}) \overline{\psi(q + \frac{x}{2})} dx. \quad (3)$$

Then there is no difficulty to see that $\int \Phi(\psi, \psi)(q, p) dp = |\psi(q)|^2$ and that $\int \Phi(\psi, \psi)(q, p) dq = |\hat{\psi}(p)|^2$; this is what makes this representation useful in quantum mechanics, for it allows to

[†]See [26] for more insight into this deep connexion with the Heisenberg group representations.

recover the probability distribution of an observable and its dual (e.g. position and momentum, electric and magnetic field...) as marginal distributions of the Wigner transform of ψ (even though $\Phi(\psi, \psi)$, being in general non-positive, is not a probability density *stricto sensu*).

Another consequence is that, generally speaking, a decrease condition on $\Phi(\psi, \psi)$ implies a decrease condition on both ψ and $\widehat{\psi}$. From the results of § 3, this implies a decrease condition on the Hermite coefficients of ψ : the object of § 4 is to show that the converse is true.

This result can be extended to mixed states in the following manner: let $[\rho_{m,n}]$ be the (infinite) *density matrix* of ρ in the Fock basis. For instance, in the case of a pure state $\rho = \rho_\psi$,

$$\rho_{m,n} = \langle \psi, h_m \rangle \overline{\langle \psi, h_n \rangle}. \quad (4)$$

Assuming that $\rho_{m,n}$ decreases ultrarapidly when $m+n \rightarrow \infty$, we shall show that Φ_ρ also decreases ultrarapidly when $|p| + |q| \rightarrow \infty$. However, in § 4.2 we see that there are (necessarily mixed) states for which Φ_ρ decreases ultrarapidly but not $\rho_{m,n}$.

Another object of interest is $\widehat{\Phi}_\rho$, the 2-dimensional Fourier transform of Φ_ρ . In radar technology, this function is known as the *ambiguity function*. Its decrease rate rules the regularity of Φ_ρ , which is of importance in statistical estimation, see Butucea *et al.* [6]. We study the decrease and regularity properties of $\widehat{\Phi}_\rho$ in § 4.3.

This leads to studying the matrix elements of the Weyl transform: combining (2) and (3) we see that, writing

$$\Phi_{m,n}(q, p) := \Phi(h_m, h_n)(q, p) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int e^{ipx} h_m(q - \frac{x}{2}) h_n(q + \frac{x}{2}) dx, \quad (5)$$

we have just $\Phi_\rho = \sum_{m,n} \rho_{m,n} \Phi_{m,n}$. Similarly, we define

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{m,n}(q, p) := \frac{1}{2} \Phi_{m,n} \left(\frac{q}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{p}{\sqrt{2}} \right).$$

These functions, named *special Hermite functions* by Strichartz [26], are remarkable. Although they are not exactly 2-dimensional Hermite functions (the latter being defined by tensor product $h_{u,v}(q, p) := h_u(q) h_v(p)$), special Hermite functions are a special linear combination (for $u+v = m+n$) of those. Consequently, they are also eigenfunctions for the 2-dimensional Fourier transform:

$$\widehat{\tilde{\Phi}_{m,n}} = (-i)^{m+n} \tilde{\Phi}_{m,n}. \quad (6)$$

Let us now expose our frame of work.

2. Functional setting

2.1. Ultra- $\mathcal{S}$ spaces

Because of (1), any function space for which the Fock states (Hermite functions) form an unconditional basis must be invariant under Fourier transform. Such spaces can be defined by weighted L^∞ conditions on both f and $\widehat{f}$, as follows.

DEFINITION 1. A continuous increasing function $\omega : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is called a *weight function* if it satisfies

- (i) $\Omega : t \mapsto \omega(e^t)$ is convex
- (ii) $\log(t) = o(\omega(t))$
- (iii) $\omega(2t) = O(\omega(t))$
- (iv) $\limsup \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2} \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

This definition should be compared with that of Braun, Meise and Taylor [5]. The only difference is that their $(\beta) \int_1^\infty \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2} dt < \infty$ is replaced by (iv), which is weaker; this is because we relax the compact support condition. As we shall see below, (iv) is related to the uncertainty principle; for technical reasons, we shall sometimes need instead the strict inequality

- (v) $\limsup \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2} < \frac{1}{2}$.

Given a weight function ω satisfying (i)–(iv), we define

$$\mathcal{S}_\omega := \left\{ f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}), f(x) = O(e^{-\omega(|x|)}) \text{ and } \widehat{f}(\xi) = O(e^{-\omega(|\xi|)}) \right\}.$$

Clearly $\mathcal{S}_\omega$ is a Banach space, if equipped with the norm

$$\|f\|_\omega := \left\| f(x) e^{\omega(|x|)} \right\|_\infty + \left\| \widehat{f}(\xi) e^{\omega(|\xi|)} \right\|_\infty.$$

Remark that $\lambda \mapsto \mathcal{S}_{\lambda\omega}$ is strictly decreasing (in the sense of inclusion) on $(0, +\infty)$. Nevertheless, it will be convenient to state our results in terms of spaces that depend only on the rate of growth of ω , that is, on the class $\overline{\omega} := \{\lambda\omega, \lambda > 0\}$. For this purpose, we introduce the ultra- $\mathcal{S}$ spaces

$$\mathcal{S}_{\{\overline{\omega}\}} := \bigcup_{\epsilon > 0} \mathcal{S}_{\epsilon\omega}$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}_{(\overline{\omega})} := \bigcap_{N < \infty} \mathcal{S}_{N\omega}.$$

Note that the constant in (iii) depends on $\overline{\omega}$ only, we shall often use this fact. Also remark that in the above union and intersection, the parameter can be taken in a countable set without changing anything to the definition.

2.2. Uncertainty principle

Bearing the name of Heisenberg, the principle that says that one cannot know with precision both the position and the momentum of a particle translates quantitatively in terms of simultaneous localization of a function and its Fourier transform; for a comprehensive study follow Havin and Jörnicke [15]. In our setting, this principle says that if ω increases too fast, then S_ω is trivial (reduced to $\{0\}$).

More precisely, let us quote the one-dimensional version of a theorem of Bonami, Demange and Jaming [3], in the descent of Hardy [14], Beurling and Hörmander [16].

THEOREM (BDJ). *Let $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and $N \geq 0$. Then*

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} \frac{|f(x)| |\widehat{f}(\xi)| e^{|x\xi|}}{(1 + |x| + |\xi|)^N} dx d\xi < \infty$$

if and only if $f(x) = p(x)e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}$, where p is a polynom of degree $< \frac{N-1}{2}$.

This theorem means that if

$$N_\omega := \inf \left\{ N, \iint_{\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+} \frac{e^{-(\omega(x) + \omega(\xi) - x\xi)}}{(1 + x + \xi)^N} dx d\xi < \infty \right\}$$

then the dimension of S_ω is

$$\left\lceil \frac{N_\omega - 1}{2} \right\rceil \leq \dim(S_\omega) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{N_\omega + 1}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

When $\frac{N_\omega + 1}{2} \in \mathbb{N}$, then one has to check whether $\iint_{\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+} \frac{e^{-(\omega(x) + \omega(\xi) - x\xi)}}{(1 + x + \xi)^{N_\omega}} dx d\xi$ is finite or not, to see whether $\dim(S_\omega) = \frac{N_\omega - 1}{2}$ or $\frac{N_\omega + 1}{2}$ respectively. In particular, the necessary and sufficient condition for S_ω to be non trivial is that

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+} e^{-(\omega(x) + \omega(\xi) - x\xi)} dx d\xi = \infty.$$

The “critical case” $\omega(x) = \frac{x^2}{2}$ is however a fuzzy frontier, because it is actually the limit inferior of $\frac{\omega(x)}{x^2}$ that counts when determining whether the above integral diverges or not. Indeed it is easy to construct a weight function ω such that $\liminf \frac{\omega(x)}{x^2} < \frac{1}{2} < \limsup \frac{\omega(x)}{x^2}$ (the only thing to take care of is (i), a piecewise affine function Ω with increasing slopes will do).

This shows that (iv), a fortiori (v), is indeed a restriction to the range of our results.[†] There might be some room for improvement here.

Another consequence of Theorem (BDJ) is that a sufficient condition for $\mathcal{S}_{\{\overline{\omega}\}}$ to be non-trivial is given by $\limsup \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2} < \infty$; for $\mathcal{S}_{(\overline{\omega})}$ it is that $\limsup \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2} = 0$.

For comparison, we recall that the fastest possible decrease for the Fourier transform of compactly supported functions is of order $e^{-C|t|}$, see [1, 5] for instance.

2.3. Sequence spaces

The spaces of Hermite coefficients for functions in $\mathcal{S}_{\{\overline{\omega}\}}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{(\overline{\omega})}$ will be identified in § 3 to the following spaces. Let ω be a weight function as in Definition 1. Then

$$\Lambda_{\omega} := \left\{ (\alpha_n) \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}}, \alpha_n = O(e^{-\omega(\sqrt{n})}) \right\}$$

endowed with the norm $\|(\alpha_n)\|_{\omega} := \sup_n |\alpha_n| e^{\omega(\sqrt{n})}$ is a Banach space, and as previously we define

$$\Lambda_{\{\overline{\omega}\}} := \bigcup_{\epsilon > 0} \Lambda_{\epsilon\omega}$$

as well as

$$\Lambda_{(\overline{\omega})} := \bigcap_{N < \infty} \Lambda_{N\omega}.$$

2.4. Topology

As a decreasing intersection of Banach spaces, $\mathcal{S}_{(\overline{\omega})}$ endowed with the projective topology (the coarsest topology that makes every embedding $\mathcal{S}_{(\overline{\omega})} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{N\omega}$ continuous) is a Fréchet space. The same holds for $\Lambda_{(\overline{\omega})}$.

The picture is a little more complicated for $\mathcal{S}_{\{\overline{\omega}\}}$ and $\Lambda_{\{\overline{\omega}\}}$. As an increasing union of Banach spaces, $(\Lambda_{\alpha\omega} \subset \Lambda_{\beta\omega} \text{ if } \beta < \alpha)$, $\Lambda_{\{\overline{\omega}\}}$ is naturally endowed with the inductive limit topology (the finest locally convex topology such that every embedding $\Lambda_{\epsilon\omega} \rightarrow \Lambda_{\{\overline{\omega}\}}$ is continuous). In the standard terminology, $\Lambda_{\{\overline{\omega}\}}$ is called a (LB)-space. The same goes for $\mathcal{S}_{\{\overline{\omega}\}}$. It is a classical problem in functional analysis to study the properties of such spaces, in particular their completeness. Note that this inductive limit is not strict (in the sense of Köthe [20, § 19.4]) because the topology on $\Lambda_{\alpha\omega}$ is not induced by that of $\Lambda_{\beta\omega}$.

PROPOSITION 2.1. $\Lambda_{\{\overline{\omega}\}}$ is a Silva space, thus complete.

[†]In fact (iv) is only used in Lemma 3.4 to guarantee that the constant K is universal, but any fixed number could replace $\frac{1}{2}$. Theorem 1 still holds if we replace (iv) by a finite limit superior. However, when (v) is asked for in Propositions 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, then $\frac{1}{2}$ is indeed the critical value.

Proof. Recall, as in [8], that a Silva space is a locally convex inductive countable union of increasing Banach spaces, such that each embedding map is compact (it is in particular a (DFS)-space). This is the case for $\Lambda_{\{\overline{\omega}\}}$, as we can see that the union may be taken over $\epsilon \in \{\frac{1}{m}, m \in \mathbb{N}\}$, that $\Lambda_{\frac{\omega}{m}} \subset \Lambda_{\frac{\omega}{m+1}}$ and that the unit ball of $\Lambda_{\frac{\omega}{m}}$ is relatively compact in $\Lambda_{\frac{\omega}{m+1}}$ because $e^{\frac{\omega(\sqrt{n})}{m}} = o\left(e^{\frac{\omega(\sqrt{n})}{m+1}}\right)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. □

COROLLARY 2.2. $\mathcal{S}_{\{\overline{\omega}\}}$ is complete.

Proof. Anticipating a little, by Theorem 1, $\mathcal{S}_{\{\overline{\omega}\}}$ is the image of $\Lambda_{\{\overline{\omega}\}}$ by a topological isomorphism. □

2.5. Tame isomorphisms

The notion of *tameness* was introduced in [13], in connexion with the Nash-Moser inverse function theorem. It is a natural notion of regularity for linear operators between Fréchet spaces or inductive limits of Banach spaces.

DEFINITION 2. Let $(E_j, |\cdot|_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(F_j, \|\cdot\|_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be two increasing families of Banach spaces, and let $E := \bigcup_j E_j$, $F := \bigcup_j F_j$ be the corresponding (LB)-spaces endowed with the inductive topologies. A linear mapping $T : E \rightarrow F$ is called *tame* if there are $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $\overline{C} < \infty$ such that for all $j \geq j_0$, there exists $C < \infty$ satisfying

$$\|T(f)\|_{\overline{C}j} \leq C|f|_j. \quad (7)$$

Let $(E_j, |\cdot|_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(F_j, \|\cdot\|_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be two decreasing families of Banach spaces (or more generally, spaces with increasing semi-norms), and let $E := \bigcap_j E_j$, $F := \bigcap_j F_j$ be the corresponding Fréchet spaces endowed with the projective topologies. In that case, a linear mapping $T : E \rightarrow F$ is said to be *tame* if there are $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $\overline{C} < \infty$ such that for all $j \geq j_0$, there exists $C < \infty$ satisfying

$$\|T(f)\|_j \leq C|f|_{\overline{C}j}. \quad (8)$$

A linear mapping T is called a *tame isomorphism* if it is bijective and if both T and T^{-1} are tame.

3. Hermite expansion

3.1. Main results

In our setting, (7) of Definition 2 will apply to spaces of type $\{\overline{\omega}\}$ and (8) will apply to spaces of type $(\overline{\omega})$.

THEOREM 1. *Let $H : f \mapsto (\langle f, h_n \rangle)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.*

If $\limsup \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2} < \infty$, then H is a tame isomorphism: $\mathcal{S}_{\{\overline{\omega}\}} \rightarrow \Lambda_{\{\overline{\omega}\}}$.

If $\limsup \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2} = 0$, then H is a tame isomorphism: $\mathcal{S}_{(\overline{\omega})} \rightarrow \Lambda_{(\overline{\omega})}$.

This theorem is proved in two parts, first the upper bound:

PROPOSITION 3.1. *There exist $\overline{C} < \infty$, depending only on $\overline{\omega}$, and $C < \infty$ (which may depend on ω) such that, for all $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\overline{C}\omega}$,*

$$\|H(f)\|_{\omega} \leq C \|f\|_{\overline{C}\omega} \quad (9)$$

and the lower bound:

PROPOSITION 3.2. *Assume (v). There exist $\overline{C} < \infty$, depending only on $\overline{\omega}$, and $C < \infty$ (which may depend on ω) such that, for all $\alpha \in \Lambda_{\overline{C}\omega}$,*

$$\|H^{-1}(\alpha)\|_{\omega} \leq C \|\alpha\|_{\overline{C}\omega}. \quad (10)$$

The two inequalities above give immediately the projective case (8), with $|f|_j := \|f\|_{j\omega}$ and $\|H(f)\|_j := \|H(f)\|_{j\omega}$. The condition $\limsup \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2} = 0$ ensures that Proposition 3.2 can be applied to any $j\omega$.

Replacing ω by $\overline{C}^{-1}\omega$ in the previous two propositions, we get (7), with $|f|_j := \|f\|_{\frac{\omega}{j}}$ and $\|H(f)\|_j := \|H(f)\|_{\frac{\omega}{j}}$. In that case, the condition $\limsup \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2} < \infty$ guarantees that Proposition 3.2 can be applied to $\frac{\omega}{j}$ when j is large enough. Thus Theorem 1 is proved.

We now turn to the proof of Propositions 3.1 and 3.2. In the sequel, C denotes a constant (not necessarily persistent) which may depend on ω and $\overline{C}$ denotes a constant which may depend only on $\overline{\omega}$. In Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5, K denotes a universal constant.

3.2. Upper bound

The proof is based on a few elementary lemmata. We consider that a weight function ω has been fixed satisfying Definition 1, and we recall that $\overline{\omega} := \{\lambda\omega, \lambda > 0\}$.

LEMMA 3.3. *Let $\Omega : t \mapsto \omega(e^t)$ and let $\Omega^* : \nu \mapsto \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \nu t - \Omega(t)$ be its convex conjugate. There exists a $C < \infty$ such that, for all $f \in \mathcal{S}_\omega$, for all $\nu \geq 0$,*

$$\|x^\nu f\|_{L^2} \leq C e^{\Omega^*(\nu+1)} \|f\|_\omega$$

and (here $D = \frac{d}{dx}$)

$$\|D^\mu f\|_{L^2} \leq C e^{\Omega^*(\mu+1)} \|f\|_\omega.$$

Note that (ii) ensures $\Omega^*(\nu) < \infty$ for all $\nu \geq 0$.

Proof. Since $\|f\|_\omega = \|\widehat{f}\|_\omega$, we only have to prove the first inequality.

Note that Ω^* is increasing, so

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|x|<1} |x|^{2\nu} |f(x)|^2 dx &\leq 2 \sup_{|x|<1} |f(x)|^2 \leq 2 \|f\|_\omega^2 \\ &\leq 2 e^{-2\Omega^*(1)} e^{2\Omega^*(\nu+1)} \|f\|_\omega^2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|x|>1} |x|^{2\nu} |f(x)|^2 dx &\leq \sup_{x>1} e^{(2\nu+2)\log(x)-2\omega(x)} \|f\|_\omega^2 \int_{|x|>1} \frac{dx}{x^2} \\ &\leq 2 e^{2 \sup_{t \geq 0} (\nu+1)t - \Omega(t)} \|f\|_\omega^2 \\ &\leq 2 e^{2\Omega^*(\nu+1)} \|f\|_\omega^2. \end{aligned}$$

Adding up the two, we get the result (with $C = \sqrt{2}(e^{-\Omega^*(1)} + 1)$). $\square$

The second lemma does the interpolation between the information on f and the information on $\widehat{f}$.

LEMMA 3.4. *There exists a $K < \infty$ such that, for all weight functions ω , there exists C , for all $f \in \mathcal{S}_\omega$, for all $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\|x^\nu D^\mu f\|_{L^2} \leq C K^{\mu+\nu} e^{\frac{\Omega^*(2\mu+2\nu+2)}{2}} \|f\|_\omega. \quad (11)$$

Proof. We write

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x^\nu D^\mu f\|_{L^2}^2 &= \int D^\mu \overline{f(x)} x^{2\nu} D^\mu f(x) dx \\
&= (-1)^\mu \int \overline{f(x)} D^\mu (x^{2\nu} D^\mu f(x)) dx \\
&= (-1)^\mu \int \overline{f(x)} \sum_{k=0}^{\mu \wedge 2\nu} \binom{\mu}{k} \frac{(2\nu)!}{(2\nu-k)!} x^{2\nu-k} D^{2\mu-k} f(x) dx \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\mu \wedge 2\nu} \binom{\mu}{k} \binom{2\nu}{k} k! \|x^{2\nu-k} f\|_{L^2} \|D^{2\mu-k} f\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C \sum_{k=0}^{\mu \wedge 2\nu} \binom{\mu}{k} \binom{2\nu}{k} k! e^{\Omega^*(2\nu-k+1) + \Omega^*(2\mu-k+1)} \|f\|_\omega^2
\end{aligned}$$

thanks to Lemma 3.3 and the fact that $\mathcal{S}_\omega \subset \mathcal{S}$.

By convexity, $\nu \mapsto \Omega^*(\nu) - \Omega^*(0)$ is superadditive, so $\Omega^*(2\nu - k + 1) \leq \Omega^*(2\nu + 1) - \Omega^*(k) + \Omega^*(0)$, and the same with μ . Thanks to (iv), there exists $x_0 =: e^{t_0}$ such that $x \geq x_0 \Rightarrow \omega(x) \leq x^2$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega^*(k) &\geq \sup_{t < t_0} kt - \Omega(t) \vee \sup_{t \geq t_0} kt - e^{2t} \\
&\geq \frac{k}{2} \left(\log \left(\frac{k}{2} \right) - 1 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

when $k \geq k_0 := 2x_0^2$. In that case, using Stirling's formula, we see that there exists a constant B such that $\frac{\log(k!)}{2} - \Omega^*(k) \leq k \frac{B}{2}$.

At this point we have shown that when $k \geq k_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\log(k!) + \Omega^*(2\nu - k + 1) \\
&\quad + \Omega^*(2\mu - k + 1) \leq \Omega^*(2\nu + 1) + \Omega^*(2\mu + 1) + kB + 2\Omega^*(0)
\end{aligned}$$

using the superadditivity again,

$$\leq \Omega^*(2\nu + 2\mu + 2) + kB + 3\Omega^*(0)$$

we crudely bound $\binom{\mu}{k} \binom{2\nu}{k}$ by $4^{\mu+\nu}$ and e^{kB} by $(e^{2B})^{\mu+\nu}$, and the lemma follows. $\square$

To finish, the proof of [21, Theorem 3.4] can be adapted, with $M_\alpha^A := (A\Omega)^*(2(\alpha + 1))/2$, to establish Proposition 3.1. For the sake of completeness, we produce our own version of this proof. The third lemma uses the previous one to bound the iterates of the Hermite operator acting on f .

LEMMA 3.5. *There exists a $K < \infty$ such that, for all weight functions ω , there exists C , for all $f \in \mathcal{S}_\omega$,*

$$\|(x^2 - D^2)^M f\|_{L^2} \leq CK^M e^{\frac{\Omega^*(4M+2)}{2}} \|f\|_\omega.$$

Proof. Using Leibnitz' rule, we can expand $(x^2 - D^2)^M$ as a sum of 2^M terms $C_{\mu,\nu} x^\nu D^\mu$ with $\mu + \nu \leq 2M$, and each $C_{\mu,\nu} \leq 4^M$. Applying (11) then yields

$$\|(x^2 - D^2)^M f\|_{L^2} \leq C(8K)^M e^{\frac{\Omega^*(4M+2)}{2}} \|f\|_\omega$$

which is the desired result. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Let ω be fixed and let $f \in \mathcal{S}_\omega$. Recall that h_n is also an eigenvector of the self-adjoint Hermite operator $x^2 - D^2$, with eigenvalue $N := 2n + 1$. For $M \geq 0$, we thus have

$$\langle (x^2 - D^2)^M f, h_n \rangle = \langle f, (x^2 - D^2)^M h_n \rangle = N^M \langle f, h_n \rangle$$

hence

$$|\langle f, h_n \rangle| \leq N^{-M} \|(x^2 - D^2)^M f\|_{L^2}$$

using Lemma 3.5

$$\leq C \left(\frac{K}{N} \right)^M e^{\frac{\Omega^*(4M+2)}{2}} \|f\|_\omega$$

optimizing in M

$$\leq C \left(\frac{N}{K} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sup_M \log \left(\frac{N}{K} \right) (2M+1) - \Omega^*(4M+2)} \|f\|_\omega$$

since Ω is convex

$$\leq C \left(\frac{N}{K} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \Omega \left(\frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{N}{K} \right) \right)} \|f\|_\omega$$

finally, using (ii) and (iii)

$$\leq C e^{-\frac{\omega(\sqrt{n})}{C}} \|f\|_\omega$$

for some $\overline{C} > 0$ that depends only on the constant in (iii), thus only on $\bar{\omega}$. In the previous reasoning we can then replace ω by $\overline{C}\omega$ to obtain (9). $\square$

3.3. Lower bound

To prove (10), we need a bound on the decrease of the Hermite functions. It is well known (see Szegő's reference [25, 8.22.14] for instance) that $|h_n(x)| \leq 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}, n \in \mathbb{N}$ (actually $|h_n(x)| \leq n^{-\frac{1}{12}}$).

LEMMA 3.6. *Let y and z be two C^2 functions: $[x_0, +\infty) \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ such that $y'(x) \rightarrow 0$, z is bounded, satisfying the differential equations*

$$\begin{aligned} y''(x) &= \phi(x)y(x) \\ z''(x) &= \psi(x)z(x), \end{aligned}$$

with continuous $\phi(x) \leq \psi(x)$, and initial conditions $y(x_0) = z(x_0)$. Then for all $x \geq x_0$, $z(x) \leq y(x)$.

Proof. Suppose that there exists $x_1 \geq x_0$ where $z(x_1) > y(x_1)$. Then for some $x_2 \in [x_0, x_1]$ we have $z'(x_2) > y'(x_2)$ and $z(x_2) \geq y(x_2)$. Consequently, for all $x \geq x_2$, $z''(x) - y''(x) \geq 0$, and $z'(x) - y'(x) \geq z'(x_2) - y'(x_2)$. When $x \rightarrow \infty$, $\liminf z'(x) \geq z'(x_2) - y'(x_2) > 0$, which contradicts the boundedness of z . $\square$

LEMMA 3.7. *For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $|x| \geq s := \sqrt{2n+1}$,*

$$|h_n(x)| \leq h_n(s)e^{-\frac{(|x|-s)^2}{2}} \leq e^{-\frac{(|x|-s)^2}{2}}.$$

Proof. By parity, we can assume $x \geq s$ (then $h_n(x) > 0$). This implies that

$$(x-s)^2 - 1 < x^2 - s^2. \quad (12)$$

Recall that h_n satisfies the differential equation $h_n'' = (x^2 - s^2)h_n$. On the other hand, $y(x) := h_n(s)e^{-\frac{(x-s)^2}{2}}$ satisfies $y'' = ((x-s)^2 - 1)y$. This, the obvious properties of h_n and y , and (12) together imply, by Lemma 3.6, that $h_n(x) \leq y(x)$. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3.2. Since $\limsup \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2} < \frac{1}{2}$, there exists $t_0 < \infty$ and $\theta < 1$ such that, for all $t \geq t_0$, $\omega(t) \leq \theta^2 \frac{t^2}{2}$. Let $n_\theta(x) := \frac{x^2(1-\theta)^2-1}{2}$.

We start with $\alpha \in \Lambda_{\overline{C}\omega}$ ($\overline{C}$ to be determined later) and suppose that $\|\alpha\|_\omega \leq 1$, which means that for all $n \geq 0$, $|\alpha_n| \leq e^{-\overline{C}\omega(\sqrt{n})}$. Thus if $f = \sum_n \alpha_n h_n$ (this series converging in $\mathcal{S}$),

$$|f(x)| \leq \underbrace{\sum_{0 \leq n \leq n_\theta(x)} e^{-\overline{C}\omega(\sqrt{n})}|h_n(x)|}_{S_1} + \underbrace{\sum_{n > n_\theta(x)} e^{-\overline{C}\omega(\sqrt{n})}|h_n(x)|}_{S_2}.$$

In the first sum, $|x| - \sqrt{2n+1} \geq \theta|x|$, so we can use Lemma 3.7 to bound $|h_n(x)|$ by $e^{-\theta^2 \frac{x^2}{2}} \leq e^{-\omega(|x|)}$ as soon as $|x| \geq t_0$. Because of (ii), the series $\sum_n e^{-\overline{C}\omega(\sqrt{n})}$ converges, so S_1 is bounded by $Ce^{-\omega(|x|)}$.

In the second sum, we simply bound $|h_n(x)|$ by 1 and use the following on the tail of the sum.

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n \geq y} e^{-\overline{C}\omega(\sqrt{n})} &\leq \int_{y-1}^{\infty} e^{-\overline{C}\omega(\sqrt{x})} dx \\
&\leq \int_{\log(y-1)}^{\infty} e^{t-\overline{C}\Omega(t/2)} dt \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\frac{\overline{C}}{2}\Omega'(\frac{\log(y)}{2}) - 1} \int_{\log(y)}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\overline{C}}{2}\Omega'(\frac{t}{2}) - 1\right) e^{t-\overline{C}\Omega(\frac{t}{2})} dt \\
&\leq \frac{e^{\log(y)-\overline{C}\omega(\sqrt{y})}}{\frac{\overline{C}}{2}\sqrt{y}\omega'(\sqrt{y}) - 1} \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{y}e^{-\overline{C}\omega(\sqrt{y})}}{\frac{\overline{C}}{2}\omega'(\sqrt{y}) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{y}}} \\
&\leq Ce^{-\frac{\overline{C}\omega(\sqrt{y})}{2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

We apply this with $y = n_\theta(x)$, $\omega(\sqrt{y}) \geq \omega(\frac{1-\theta}{2}|x|) \geq \frac{2}{C}\omega(|x|)$ by (iii), for some $\overline{C}$ that depends only on $\overline{\omega}$. Finally we obtain $S_2 \leq Ce^{-\omega(x)}$, and the proposition is proved. $\square$

Remark. Proposition 3.2 can also be shown by adapting the proof of [21, Theorem 3.4].

4. Wigner distribution

We recall the definitions of Φ_ρ and $\Phi(f, f)$, already given in the introduction as (2) and (3). If ρ is a semi-definite positive Hermitian operator: $L^2 \rightarrow L^2$ that diagonalizes in an orthonormal basis ψ_i , with eigenvalues $\mathbf{p}_i$, then

$$\Phi_\rho(q, p) := \sum_i \frac{\mathbf{p}_i}{2\pi} \int e^{ipx} \psi_i(q - \frac{x}{2}) \overline{\psi_i(q + \frac{x}{2})} dx.$$

If ρ_f represents a pure state, in other words, if it is the projector on the subspace generated by f , then we write

$$\Phi(f, f)(q, p) := \Phi_{\rho_f}(q, p) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int e^{ipx} f(q - \frac{x}{2}) \overline{f(q + \frac{x}{2})} dx.$$

4.1. *Pure states*

The squared modulus of a function f and its Fourier transform $\widehat{f}$ can be recovered from $\Phi(f, f)$ as marginal distributions

$$\int \Phi(f, f)(q, p) dp = |f(q)|^2 \quad (14)$$

and

$$\int \Phi(f, f)(q, p) dq = |\widehat{f}(p)|^2. \quad (15)$$

Let us define

$$|\Phi|_\omega := \sup_{q, p} |\Phi(q, p)| e^{2(\omega(|q|) + \omega(|p|))}$$

and

$$\|f\|_\omega := \sqrt{|\Phi(f, f)|_\omega}.$$

Clearly these are two norms, and using (14) and (15) we get by integration, for all q and for all p ,

$$|f(q)| e^{\omega(|q|)} \leq \sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\omega(|p|)} dp} \|f\|_\omega$$

as well as

$$|\widehat{f}(p)| e^{\omega(|p|)} \leq \sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\omega(|q|)} dq} \|f\|_\omega$$

the integrals being finite by (ii), hence finally

$$\|f\|_\omega \leq C \|f\|_\omega \quad (16)$$

the constant C depending only on ω . We now aim at the corresponding lower bound.

PROPOSITION 4.1. *Assume (v). There exists $\overline{C} < \infty$, depending only on $\overline{\omega}$, and $C < \infty$ (which may depend on ω), such that for all $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\overline{C}\omega}$,*

$$\|f\|_\omega \leq C \|f\|_{\overline{C}\omega}. \quad (17)$$

We prove actually a more general result, which gives (17) as a particular case. Let

$$\|\rho\|_\omega := \sup_{m, n} |\rho_{m, n}| e^{\omega(\sqrt{m}) + \omega(\sqrt{n})}.$$

PROPOSITION 4.2. *Assume (v). There exists $\overline{C} < \infty$, depending only on $\overline{\omega}$, and $C < \infty$ (which may depend on ω), such that for all ρ ,*

$$|\Phi_\rho|_\omega \leq C \|\rho\|_{\overline{C}\omega}. \quad (18)$$

The proof is based on radial bounds for the special Hermite functions. We recall that

$$\Phi_\rho(q, p) = \sum_{m,n} \rho_{m,n} \Phi_{m,n}(q, p)$$

where $\Phi_{m,n}$, defined by (5), can also, as shown in [22], be expressed as follows: when $m \geq n$,

$$\Phi_{m,n}(q, p) = \frac{(-1)^m}{\pi} \left(\frac{n!}{m!} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-(q^2+p^2)} \left(\sqrt{2}(ip - q) \right)^{m-n} L_n^{m-n}(2q^2 + 2p^2). \quad (19)$$

Here $L_n^\alpha := (n!)^{-1} e^x x^{-\alpha} \frac{d^n}{dx^n} (e^{-x} x^{n+\alpha})$ is the (non normalized) Laguerre polynomial of degree n and order α .

If $m < n$, then by Hermitian symmetry $\Phi_{m,n}(q, p) = \Phi_{n,m}(q, -p)$, which is equivalent to taking the canonical generalization of Laguerre polynomials for $-n \leq \alpha < 0$: $L_n^\alpha(x) := \frac{(n+\alpha)!}{n!} (-x)^{-\alpha} L_{n+\alpha}^{-\alpha}(x)$. But since ρ is Hermitian, $\rho_{n,m} = \overline{\rho_{m,n}}$, we only have to consider $m \geq n$ in the sums below.

The modulus of $\Phi_{m,n}$ is thus radial: writing $r := \sqrt{q^2 + p^2}$, we have

$$l_{m,n}(r) := |\Phi_{m,n}(q, p)| = \frac{2^{\frac{m-n}{2}}}{\pi} \left(\frac{n!}{m!} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-r^2} r^{m-n} |L_n^{m-n}(2r^2)|. \quad (20)$$

What we need at this point is a bound on $l_{m,n}$ that is uniform on m and n , in the same fashion as Lemma 3.7:

LEMMA 4.3. *There exists a constant K such that, for all $m \geq n$ and $s := \sqrt{m+n+1}$, for all $r \geq 0$,*

$$l_{m,n}(r) \leq K \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 0 \leq r \leq s \\ e^{-(r-s)^2} & \text{if } r \geq s. \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

Proof. When $r \leq s$, the result follows from the uniform bounds on Laguerre polynomials, for instance given by Krasikov [19]:

$$(L_n^\alpha(x))^2 e^{-x} x^{\alpha+1} \leq 1444 n^{-\frac{1}{6}} (n + \alpha + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (22)$$

to be used in (20) with $x = 2r^2$ and $\alpha = m - n$.

When $r \geq s$, $L_n^\alpha(2r^2)$ doesn't vanish and keeps the same sign as $L_n^\alpha(2s^2)$. Now, as it can be seen from [25, 5.1.2], the function $z(r) := \sqrt{r} l_{m,n}(r)$ satisfies the differential equation $z'' = (4(r^2 - s^2) + \frac{\alpha^2 - 1/4}{r^2})z$. On the other hand, $y(r) := \sqrt{s} l_{m,n}(s) e^{-(r-s)^2}$ satisfies $y'' = (4(r-s)^2 - 2)y$. When $r \geq s$,

$$4(r-s)^2 - 2 < 4(r^2 - s^2) + \frac{\alpha^2 - 1/4}{r^2} \quad (23)$$

from which we conclude with Lemma 3.6 that $z(r) \leq y(r)$. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 4.1. By (4) and Proposition 3.1, if $\rho = \rho_f$ is a pure state, then for all m, n ,

$$|\rho_{m,n}|e^{\omega(\sqrt{m})+\omega(\sqrt{n})} = |\langle f, h_m \rangle|e^{\omega(\sqrt{m})}|\langle f, h_n \rangle|e^{\omega(\sqrt{n})} \leq C\|f\|_{\overline{C}\omega}^2$$

hence, applying Proposition 4.2,

$$\|f\|_{\omega}^2 = |\Phi(f, f)|_{\omega} \leq C^2\|f\|_{\overline{C}\omega}^2.$$

□

Proof of Proposition 4.2. It is very similar to Proposition 3.2. There exists $t_0 < \infty$ and $\theta < 1$ such that, for all $t \geq t_0$, $\omega(t) \leq \theta^2 \frac{t^2}{2}$. Let $m_{\theta}(r) := r^2(1 - \theta)^2 - 1$ and assume that $\|\rho\|_{\overline{C}\omega} \leq 1$, $\overline{C}$ to be chosen later. For all m, n we have $|\rho_{m,n}| \leq e^{-\overline{C}(\omega(\sqrt{m})+\omega(\sqrt{n}))}$. When $m + n \leq m_{\theta}(r)$, $r - s \geq \theta r$ and by (21), this means that $l_{m,n}(r) \leq Ke^{-\theta^2 r^2} \leq Ke^{-2\omega(r)}$. So

$$\sum_{m+n \leq m_{\theta}(r)} |\rho_{m,n}|l_{m,n}(r) \leq Ce^{-2\omega(r)} \quad (24)$$

for $C := K \sum_{m,n} e^{-\overline{C}(\omega(\sqrt{m})+\omega(\sqrt{n}))}$.

On the other hand, comparing the sum to the integral, we get similarly as in (13)

$$\sum_{m+n \geq y} e^{-\overline{C}(\omega(\sqrt{m})+\omega(\sqrt{n}))} \leq Ce^{-\frac{\overline{C}}{\sqrt{2}}\omega(\sqrt{y})}$$

using (21) again,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m+n \geq m_{\theta}(r)} |\rho_{m,n}|l_{m,n}(r) &\leq Ce^{-\frac{\overline{C}}{\sqrt{2}}\omega(\sqrt{m_{\theta}(r)})} \\ &\leq Ce^{-2\omega(r)} \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

if the constant $\overline{C}$ is chosed large enough (depending only on $\overline{\omega}$). Combining (24) and (25) yields the announced result.

□

If the exact form of ω is known, such as $\omega(x) = x^{\beta}$, $0 < \beta < 2$, a constant $\overline{C}$ close to the optimal can easily be obtained. An application to quantum statistics will be presented in a forthcoming paper.

4.2. Mixed states

If we apply (16) to the right-hand side of (9), then use (4), we obtain that the density matrix coefficients of a pure state f decrease as

$$|\rho_{m,n}| \leq C\|f\|_{\overline{C}\omega} e^{-(\omega(\sqrt{m})+\omega(\sqrt{n}))}$$

in other words, we have a converse to Proposition 4.2, but only when $\rho = \rho_f$. No such converse can hold in the case of a general (mixed) state, as the following example shows.

Following Butucea *et al.* [6], let

$$\rho_{m,n} := \frac{(-1)^m \delta_{m,n}}{(m+1)(m+2)} = \begin{cases} (-1)^m \int_0^1 z^m (1-z) dz & \text{if } m = n \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

We also recall an integral representation for Laguerre functions [25, 5.4.1], for $\alpha > -1$:

$$L_m^\alpha(x) = \frac{e^x x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}{m!} \int_0^\infty e^{-t} t^{m+\frac{\alpha}{2}} J_\alpha(2\sqrt{tx}) dt.$$

Then, using (19) once again with $\alpha = m - n = 0$ and $x := 2(q^2 + p^2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_\rho(q, p) &= \frac{e^{-\frac{x}{2}}}{\pi} \sum_m \int_0^1 z^m (1-z) dz L_m^0(x) \\ &= \frac{e^{\frac{x}{2}}}{\pi} \int_0^1 \int_0^\infty \sum_m z^m (1-z) \frac{t^m}{m!} e^{-t} J_0(2\sqrt{tx}) dt dz \\ &= \frac{e^{\frac{x}{2}}}{\pi} \int_0^1 (1-z) \int_0^\infty e^{(z-1)t} J_0(2\sqrt{tx}) dt dz \\ &= \frac{e^{\frac{x}{2}}}{\pi} \int_0^1 e^{\frac{x}{z-1}} dz \\ &\leq \frac{e^{-\frac{x}{2}}}{\pi} \end{aligned}$$

We see that, although $\rho_{m,n}$ has algebraic decrease along the diagonal, $\Phi_\rho(q, p)$ decreases like $e^{-(q^2+p^2)}$. Cancellations occur because of the alternating signs in $\rho_{m,m}$.

4.3. Ambiguity function

The *ambiguity function* $A(f, f)$ of a signal $f \in L^2$ is simply the Fourier transform in (q, p) of its Wigner transform. Knowing (6),

$$A(f, f)(\vartheta, \varpi) := \widehat{\Phi(f, f)}(\vartheta, \varpi) = \sum_{m,n} \frac{(-i)^{m+n}}{2} \langle f, h_m \rangle \overline{\langle f, h_n \rangle} \Phi_{m,n}\left(\frac{\vartheta}{2}, \frac{\varpi}{2}\right)$$

The proof of Proposition 4.1 works *mutatis mutandis* to obtain

$$\sqrt{|A(f, f)|_\omega} \leq C \|f\|_{\overline{C}_\omega}$$

the constant C depending on ω and $\overline{C}$ depending on $\overline{\omega}$.

Naturally, the equivalent of (16) holds also:

$$\|f\|_\omega \leq C \sqrt{|A(f, f)|_{\overline{C}_\omega}}$$

in particular $\Phi(f, f)$ and $A(f, f)$ are tamely equivalent in their respective ω norms. However, as the previous example (26) shows, this is not necessarily true for mixed states.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank the anonymous referee for his valuable comments and suggestions.

References

1. AUBRY, J.-M. On the rate of pointwise divergence of Fourier and wavelet series in L^p . *J. Approx. Theory* 538, 1 (2006), 97–111.
2. BIERSTEDT, K. D., AND BONET, J. Some aspects of the modern theory of Fréchet spaces. *Rev. R. Acad. Cienc. Exactas Fís. Nat., Ser. A Mat.* 97, 2 (2003), 159–188.
3. BONAMI, A., DEMANGE, B., AND JAMING, P. Hermite functions and uncertainty principles for the Fourier and the windowed Fourier transforms. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana* 19, 1 (2003), 23–55.
4. BOYD, J. P. Asymptotic coefficients of Hermite function series. *J. Comput. Phys.* 54 (1984), 382–410.
5. BRAUN, R. W., MEISE, R., AND TAYLOR, B. A. Ultradifferentiable functions and Fourier analysis. *Results Math.* 17, 3-4 (1990), 206–237.
6. BUTUCEA, C., GUȚĂ, M., AND ARTILES, L. Minimax and adaptive estimation of the Wigner function in quantum homodyne tomography with noisy data. To appear in *Ann. Stat.*, 2007.
7. CAOLA, M. J. Self-Fourier functions. *J. Phys. A* 24, 19 (1991), L1143–L1144.
8. COOPER, J. B. On a generalisation of Silva spaces. *Mathematische Annalen* 182, 4 (1969), 309–313.
9. CORCORAN, C. J., AND PASCH, K. A. Self-Fourier functions and coherent laser combination. *J. Phys. A* 37, 37 (2004), L461–L469.
10. DRAGOMAN, D. The Wigner distribution function of self-Fourier functions. *J. Modern Opt.* 43, 9 (1996), 1933–1938.
11. GRAWE, M. Asymptotic growth of Hermite series and an application to the theory of the Riemann zeta function. *Results Math.* 31, 1-2 (1997), 105–114.
12. GRÖCHENIG, K., AND ZIMMERMANN, G. Spaces of test functions via the STFT. *J. Funct. Spaces Appl.* 2, 1 (2004), 25–53.
13. HAMILTON, R. S. The inverse function theorem of Nash and Moser. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* 7, 1 (1982), 65–222.
14. HARDY, G. H. A theorem concerning Fourier transforms. *J. London Math. Soc.* 8 (1933), 227–231.
15. HAVIN, V., AND JÖRICKE, B. *The Uncertainty Principle in Harmonic Analysis*. Springer, 1997.
16. HÖRMANDER, L. A uniqueness theorem of Beurling for Fourier transform pairs. *Ark. Mat.* 29, 2 (1991), 237–240.
17. JANSSEN, A. J. E. M., AND VAN ELJNDHOVEN, S. J. L. Spaces of type W , growth of Hermite coefficients, Wigner distribution, and Bargmann transform. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 152, 2 (1990), 368–390.
18. JARCHOW, H. *Locally Convex Spaces*. Teubner, Stuttgart, 1981.
19. KRASIKOV, I. Inequalities for orthonormal Laguerre polynomials. *J. Approx. Theory* 144, 1 (2007), 1–26.
20. KÖTHE, G. *Topological vector spaces I*, vol. 159 of *Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer, New-York, 1969.
21. LANGENBRUCH, M. Hermite functions and weighted spaces of generalized functions. *Manuscripta Math.* 119 (2006), 269–285.
22. LEONHARDT, U. *Measuring the Quantum State of Light*. Cambridge, 1997.
23. MEISE, R., AND VOGT, D. *Introduction to functional analysis*, vol. 2 of *Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Clarendon Press, 1997.
24. PARIS, M., AND ŘEHÁČEK, J., Eds. *Quantum State Estimation*, vol. 649 of *Lectures Notes in Physics*. Springer, 2004.

- 25. SZEGÖ, G. *Orthogonal polynomials*, revised ed., vol. 23 of *AMS Colloquium Publications*. American Mathematical Society, 1959.
- 26. THANGAVELU, S. *Lectures on Hermite and Laguerre expansions*, vol. 42 of *Mathematical Notes*. Princeton Univ. Press, 1993.

Jean-Marie Aubry

Université Paris-Est

LAMA – UMR CNRS 8050

94010 CRÉTEIL

FRANCE

jmaubry@math.cnrs.fr